

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 22-24 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,650,831 (Farwell). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

With regard to claim 1, Farwell does not disclose, at least, a digital graphics bus coupled to a digital receiver in a first housing and a digital display in a second housing. In this regard, the Office Action appears to contend that the video graphics adapter (VGA) bus of Farwell is a digital graphics bus. However, a VGA bus is not a digital bus, as a VGA bus instead transmits analog data. Farwell, col. 11, lns. 34-36. Accordingly, for at least this reason claim 1 and claims 2-3 and 5-10 depending therefrom are patentable over Farwell.

With respect to independent claim 22, Farwell does not disclose a housing including a plurality of slots, each having a plug adapted to receive more than one type of serial bus interface. That is, nowhere does Farwell disclose that the personal computer 118 includes such slots having plugs to receive multiple types of serial bus interfaces. Instead, as shown in FIG. 3 of Farwell, different components are connected to a PCI bus, which is a parallel bus. Thus for at least this reason, claim 22 and claims 23-24 and 28 depending therefrom are patentable over Farwell.

Claims 4, 11-21, 24-27 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,236,727 (Ciacelli) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,734,921 (Giangano). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to dependent claim 4, which depends from claim 1, neither reference teaches or suggests a receiver to receive a digital television signal in a first housing, a digital television display in a second housing, and a digital graphics bus coupled therebetween. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claim 4 is patentable over the proposed combination.

With regard to amended independent claim 11, neither Ciacelli or Giangano either alone or in combination, teach or suggest an encryption engine in a digital television receiver and a decryption engine in a digital television display, both of which are coupled to a digital graphics bus. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claim 11 and claims 13-21 depending therefrom are patentable over the proposed combination.

With respect to claim 24, which depends from claim 22, neither reference teaches or suggests a housing including a plurality of slots each having a plug adapted to receive more than one type of serial bus interface. Claims 24-27 are patentable for the further independent reason

that neither reference teaches or suggests an encryption engine coupled to an external bus. Instead, as shown in Ciacelli, the encryption and decryption modules are present within a CPU 11. Accordingly, claims 24-27 are patentable.

For at least the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 4, independent claim 29 is patentable over Ciacelli in view of Giangano, as neither reference teaches or suggests providing a receiver in a first housing for receiving a digital television signal, and providing a display in a second housing coupled to the first housing and transmitting encrypted video signals between the housings. Instead, Ciacelli merely discloses a content scrambling system that is internal to a computer system and therefore within a single housing. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 29 and claims 30-31 depending therefrom are patentable over the proposed combination.

Claims 16-19 stand rejected under §103(a) over Ciacelli in view of Giangano and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,784,427 (Bennett). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. This is so, for at least the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 11 from which claims 16-19 depend.

Claims 14, 27 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ciacelli in view of Giangano, in view of Bennett, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,969,909 (Warren). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, at least for the same reasons discussed above regarding claims 11, 24, and 29, from which these claims depend, respectively. The rejection of these claims is further improper, as Warren does not teach or suggest changing encryption levels on frame boundaries. Instead, Warren only teaches that encryption keys may be different on different frames; there is no teaching or suggestion to change encryption levels on frame boundaries. Accordingly, for these further reasons, claims 14, 27 and 30 are patentable.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 22, 2004



Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024-1805
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE